



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,935	12/08/2005	Shin Kurita	DK-US055289	1043
22919 7590 11/04/2008 GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP 1233 20TH STREET, NW, SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036-2680				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, HOANG M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3748				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/559,935

Applicant(s)

KURITA ET AL.

Examiner

Hoang M. Nguyen

Art Unit

3748

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

Applicant's amendment dated September 30, 2008, has been fully considered.

Applicant had amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 4, cancelled claims 3-4, and argued the 103 rejection is not valid because Yagi does not teach the cut portion, and the larger width is not facing the partition plate. The Examiner agrees, but a new ground of rejections has been made using a reference already of record, JP 57-176686, to show the roller 8 having larger width facing the lower side, and the cut portions 8a, 8b.

Applicant argued it would not have been obvious to combine the references. The Examiner disagrees because the modified feature is simply providing the roller with larger width in the multistage compressor. The multistage compressor using rollers is well known, it would have been obvious to replace one type of roller with another.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2001-099083 (Matsumoto et al) in view of JP 57-176686. Matsumoto et al discloses a two-stage compressor and a closed container 110, the compressor having two stages

121, 122, with rollers, a partition plate in between. Matsumoto et al does not disclose the rollers having a larger width facing the partition plate. JP 57-176686 discloses a rotary compressor having a roller 8 in which one end surface is larger than the other end surface, said roller 8 having a larger width cut portion 8b facing the lower side, and the other end with cut portion 8a. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to replace the rollers in Matsumoto et al with the rollers having larger width cut portions facing the lower side as taught by JP 57-176686 for the purpose of providing better lubrication.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsumoto et al in view of JP 57-176686 and JP 1134092 (Souichi). Matsumoto et al as modified by JP 57-176686 discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 1, but does not disclose a roller made from sintered alloy. Souichi is relied upon to disclose a roller made from sintered alloy. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to form the roller in JP 57-176686 by sintered alloy as taught by Souichi for the purpose of preventing abrasion.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Examiner Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4861. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday--Friday from 12:30 AM to 10:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas E. Denion can be reached on 571-272-4859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hoang M Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3748

HOANG NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3748

Hoang Minh Nguyen
11/4/2008